

Astrophysical Neutrinos and Flavor Evolution With Self Interaction

Taygun BULMUS¹ and Yamac PEHLIVAN¹

¹*Department of Physics, Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University, Sisli, Istanbul, 34380, Turkey*

E-mail: ismail.taygun.bulmus@ogr.msgsu.edu.tr

In a core collapse supernova, collective oscillations of neutrinos emitted by the proto-neutron star significantly modifies the partition of energy between different flavors in a way which is potentially important for the nucleosynthesis of heavy elements at the outer layers. As the outcome of collective oscillations depends nonlinearly on the chosen initial conditions proto-neutron star, their systematical study across the proto-neutron star model space may provide answers to some key questions.

KEYWORDS: supernova neutrinos, collective neutrino oscillations, spectral split

Core collapse supernovae are the most extreme neutrino events in the Universe. The gravitational binding energy of the collapsed matter is emitted almost entirely in terms of neutrinos by the newly formed proto-neutron at the center as it rapidly cools down in the next few seconds [1–4]. These neutrinos are thought to play important roles in the dynamics of the exploding star [5], as well as in the r -process [6] and ν -process [7, 8] nucleosynthesis at the outer layers. Neutrinos freely stream inside the supernova once they decouple from the proto-neutron star, but the energy partition between different neutrino and anti-neutrino flavors change as neutrinos undergo flavor evolution during their propagation. The flavor evolution is strongly influenced by the neutrino scattering in the matter despite the small cross sections at the MeV energies relevant for the supernova because tiny neutrino scattering amplitudes coherently superpose to create a macroscopic refractive effect on neutrino propagation [9, 10]. At the high neutrino densities near the proto-neutron star, neutrino-neutrino scattering also contributes to the refraction [11, 12] in which case identical particle effects couple the flavor evolutions the interacting neutrinos [13, 14], turning the neutrino flavor evolution into a many-body problem [15–23]. Several emergent phenomena resulting from the many-body nature of this *neutrino self refraction* were identified such as synchronized oscillations, [24, 25], bi-polar oscillations [26], and spectral splits (or swaps) [27] which are now generally referred to as *collective neutrino oscillations*.

As a nonlinear many-body system, flavor evolution of neutrinos near the proto-neutron star seem to be sensitive to various factors. For example, the influence of the geometry is investigated by various groups [28–30]. Our aim is to systematically investigate the dependence of the collective neutrino oscillations on the initial conditions, i.e., the energy spectra of all neutrino and anti neutrino flavors at the point where they thermally decouple from the proto-neutron star and begin freely streaming inside the supernova. Since different neutrino flavors undergo different interactions inside the proto-neutron star, they thermally decouple from different radii with unequal temperatures. Although model independent arguments give us a temperature hierarchy of $T_{\nu_e} < T_{\bar{\nu}_e} < T_{\nu_x} = T_{\bar{\nu}_x}$ where x denotes both muon and tau flavors, the actual values of these temperatures are significantly model dependent. For a recent compilation of different results from neutrino transport simulations inside the proto-neutron star, see Ref. [31]. Number fluxes for different flavors can also differ slightly from one another [32, 33].




Fig. 1. Initial conditions with $T_{\nu_e} = 3.5$ MeV, $T_{\bar{\nu}_e} = 4.0$ MeV, $T_{\nu_x} = T_{\bar{\nu}_x} = 8.0$ MeV. We take number fluxes to be the same for all neutrino and antineutrino flavors. Dashed lines show the initial neutrino spectra at the proto-neutron star with a 10 km radius. Continuous lines show the final neutrino spectra at 500 km away from the center.




Fig. 2. Initial conditions with $T_{\nu_e} = 3.8$ MeV, $T_{\bar{\nu}_e} = 4.8$ MeV, $T_{\nu_x} = T_{\bar{\nu}_x} = 5.7$ MeV. neutrino number fluxes are taken to be unequal with slightly more muon and tau flavor (anti) neutrinos than electron (anti) neutrinos. Dashed lines show the initial neutrino spectra at the proto-neutron star with a 10 km radius. Continuous lines show the final neutrino spectra at 500 km away from the center.

Figs. 1 and 2 show the results of collective neutrino oscillations for two different sets of initial conditions on the proto-neutron star. Both figures are obtained by treating the self refraction of neutrinos under the mean field approximation [15] and by adopting the neutrino bulb model which is the simplest effective treatment of the geometry of intersecting neutrino trajectories [27]. The background density of other particles is assumed to be constant and their refractive effect is treated by using effective mixing parameters in matter [34, 35]. We assume inverted mass hierarchy. Note that since ν_μ and ν_τ are emitted with almost the same initial spectrum from the proto-neutron star, one can conveniently work in a rotated flavor basis $\tilde{\nu}_\mu$ and $\tilde{\nu}_\tau$, which mix with ν_e but not with each other (see, e.g., Ref. [36]).

The results shown in Figs. 1 and 2 are qualitatively different from each other: in Fig. 1, there is a complete spectral swap at high energies, i.e., the energy spectra are exchanged between the flavors after the collective oscillations. In Fig. 2 the swap is only partial. It is clear that even in this simplest scenario, we do not fully understand how the behaviour of self interacting neutrinos, as a nonlinear many-body system, depend on the initial conditions. We believe that it may be useful to carry out a systematical study of the proto-neutron star model space and identify the response of the neutrino collective oscillations in different regions. In studies of r or ν -process nucleosynthesis in the supernova, one usually adopts certain initial neutrino spectra and calculates the isotopic yields. It is interesting to consider the reverse problem and ask if there is a set of initial conditions favorable for the nucleosynthesis by scanning the model space. Recently a formal correspondence is established between the flavor evolution of self interacting neutrinos and the dynamics of fermionic Cooper pairs [21, 36, 37] leading to the identification of some dynamical symmetries. Since dynamical symmetries and the associated invariants restrict the motion of the system in the phase space, they can possibly be used to relate the behaviour of neutrinos to the initial conditions on the proto-neutron star.

This work was supported by the Scientific and Technological Research Council of Turkey under project number 115F214.

References

- [1] S. A. Colgate and R. H. White: *Astrophys.J.* **143** (1966) 626.
- [2] S. Woosley and T. Weaver: *Ann.Rev.Astron.Astrophys.* **24** (1986) 205.
- [3] W. D. Arnett, J. N. Bahcall, R. P. Kirshner, and S. E. Woosley: *Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys.* **27** (1989) 629.
- [4] K. Kotake, K. Sato, and K. Takahashi: *Reports on Progress in Physics* **69** (2005) 971.
- [5] T. Takiwaki, K. Kotake, and Y. Suwa: *Astrophys.J.* **786** (2014) 83.
- [6] S. Woosley, J. Wilson, G. Mathews, R. Hoffman, and B. Meyer: *Astrophys.J.* **433** (1994) 229.
- [7] R. Epstein, S. Colgate, and W. Haxton: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **61** (1988) 2038.
- [8] S. Woosley, D. Hartmann, R. Hoffman, and W. Haxton: *Astrophys.J.* **356** (1990) 272.
- [9] L. Wolfenstein: *Phys.Rev.* **D17** (1978) 2369.
- [10] S. Mikheev and A. Y. Smirnov: *Nuovo Cim.* **C9** (1986) 17.
- [11] G. M. Fuller, R. W. Mayle, J. R. Wilson, and D. N. Schramm: *Astrophys.J.* **322** (1987) 795.
- [12] M. J. Savage, R. A. Malaney, and G. M. Fuller: *Astrophys.J.* **368** (1991) 1.
- [13] J. T. Pantaleone: *Phys.Rev.* **D46** (1992) 510.
- [14] J. T. Pantaleone: *Phys.Lett.* **B287** (1992) 128.
- [15] G. Sigl and G. Raffelt: *Nucl.Phys.* **B406** (1993) 423.
- [16] H. Duan, G. M. Fuller, and Y.-Z. Qian: *Ann.Rev.Nucl.Part.Sci.* **60** (2010) 569.
- [17] N. F. Bell, A. A. Rawlinson, and R. Sawyer: *Phys.Lett.* **B573** (2003) 86.
- [18] A. Friedland and C. Lunardini: *JHEP* **0310** (2003) 043.
- [19] A. Friedland and C. Lunardini: *Phys.Rev.* **D68** (2003) 013007.
- [20] A. Balantekin and Y. Pehlivan: *J.Phys.* **G34** (2007) 47.
- [21] Y. Pehlivan, A. Balantekin, T. Kajino, and T. Yoshida: *Phys.Rev.* **D84** (2011) 065008.
- [22] D. Väänänen and C. Volpe: *Phys.Rev.* **D88** (2013) 065003.
- [23] C. Volpe, D. Väänänen, and C. Espinoza: *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 113010.
- [24] S. Samuel: *Phys.Rev.* **D48** (1993) 1462.
- [25] V. A. Kostelecky and S. Samuel: *Phys.Rev.* **D52** (1995) 621.
- [26] S. Samuel: *Phys.Rev.* **D53** (1996) 5382.
- [27] H. Duan, G. M. Fuller, J. Carlson, and Y.-Z. Qian: *Phys.Rev.* **D74** (2006) 105014.
- [28] G. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, and A. Mirizzi: *Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics* **2007** (2007) 010.
- [29] S. Abbar, H. Duan, and S. Shalgar: *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 065019.
- [30] G. Raffelt, S. Sarikas, and D. de Sousa Seixas: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** (2013) 091101.
- [31] G. J. Mathews, J. Hidaka, T. Kajino, and J. Suzuki: *The Astrophysical Journal* **790** (2014) 115.

- [32] R. Buras, H.-T. Janka, M. T. Keil, G. G. Raffelt, and M. Rampp: *Astrophys. J.* **587** (2003) 320.
- [33] B. Dasgupta, A. Mirizzi, I. Tamborra, and R. Tomas: *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 093008.
- [34] T.-K. Kuo and J. T. Pantaleone: *Rev.Mod.Phys.* **61** (1989) 937.
- [35] K. A. Olive et al.: *Chin. Phys.* **C38** (2014) 090001.
- [36] Y. Pehlivan, A. Balantekin, and T. Kajino: *Phys.Rev.* **D90** (2014) 065011.
- [37] Y. Pehlivan, A. L. Subaşı, N. Ghazanfari, S. Birol, and H. Yüksel: (2016).